Social class is an important issue that must be taken into consideration when examining crime and criminal behavior in the United States. Social class is often viewed as a critical factor that influences the motivation to commit criminal activities. Traditional explanations for the relationship between crime and social class indicates an inverse correlation between lower class standing and the likelihood a person will to be involved in criminal behavior (Shaw and McKay 1929; Sampson 1986; Messner and Krohn 1990). This premise has been, and continues to be, heavily debated (Elliott and Huizinga 1983; Dunaway et al. 2000).

Frequently students come to class with the preconceived idea that individuals are solely accountable for their actions without regard for the social structure that influences life chances and opportunities. Many of these notions are fueled by movies, televisions shows, and the news media that tend to focus on street crimes committed by minorities and the lower class. Generally, individual choices are emphasized with little regard for how other social factors played their own role in the person's criminal behavior.

The majority of criminal justice classes include an examination of various theories and statistical reports that explain crime and criminal behavior. Although criminal justice instructors make an effort to dispel the myths that
many students have regarding class and crime, many theories (i.e., structural and conflict theories) use social class as the basis for the construction and understanding of crime. Classical theories of deviance and crime often target the lower class as the culprits of social problems and the resulting criminal activities. While classical theories examine structural components of criminal behavior, social process and rational choice theories examine individual choices and how a person's interaction with his/her environment may contribute to deviant or criminal behavior. Furthermore, crime statistics (particularly the UCR and NCVS) play a role in perpetuating the notion that the majority of crimes are committed by the poor or marginal individuals by not reporting crimes that are most often committed by the middle and upper class (i.e., "white-collar," corporate, and state crimes). Therefore, it becomes important that social class be addressed in such a way that students understand fully the implications of class on crime and criminality and that criminal behavior is an equal opportunity event.

This article describes an interactive exercise that helps students better understand how social class may influence deviant and/or criminal behavior as a response to wanting to maintain status quo (particularly those in middle to upper class levels), economic hardships (that may occur at various class levels), the lack of social power, income inequality, or the lack of resources.

Discussion of student reactions is based on the accumulated responses to this activity. The conclusions drawn are a result of the authors' observations over four years and are not intended to represent an empirical approach. Although the lack of formal empirical testing may be seen as a limitation, this interactive exercise proved to be very effective in demonstrating to students how some of their perceived notions about social class and criminal behavior may be incorrect.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Interactive learning is not a new phenomenon used in teaching. Piaget alleged that to truly learn one must be actively engaged in the process. One of his main goals was to insure that students learn "how to use information in new and innovative ways" (Wolfer and Baker 2000:80). By using interactive learning, Piaget believed that students would be encouraged to become creative and critical thinkers (Ginsberg and Opper 1988).

Kolb's (1976) experiential learning model demonstrates how students can be sensitized to what they are learning in class and how this information applies to real life situations. This experience ultimately helps the student to gain knowledge of the world outside of the classroom as well as what is actually being taught in class. According to Greek (1995:153), active learning is "a philosophy of education based on the premise that students best internalize information when they are directly involved in their
own learning.” Brown (2001:102) expressed a similar premise when stating that “higher education can play a major part in sensitizing and reinforcing student attitudes and perceptions . . . and how the process of learning contributes to the way that knowledge is used.”

Furthermore, interactive learning can increase retention by creating an atmosphere in which the student stays focused and interested in the topics discussed in the classroom (Robinson 2000; Bonwell and Sutherland 1996). Dorn (1989) found that simulation games increase students’ interest and motivation because the games can be effective in changing some attitudes and are at least as effective as more conventional pedagogy in teaching cognitive learning.

Interactive exercises have been used in a variety of sociology classes to examine social stratification and social inequality (Davis 1992; Hilligoss 1992; Sernau 1995; Brezina 1996; McCammon 1999; Jessup 2001). These exercises enhance the students’ understanding regarding the nature of social inequality in our society. Furthermore, those who used interactive exercises indicated that many students developed a more realistic view of how society works and how social class can and does impact individuals and groups (Eells 1987; Dorn 1989; McCammon 1999; Jessup 2001).

There is a downside to using interactive or simulation games as a tool with which to teach students about social reality. The most common problem is the ability to replicate reality in its undiluted form. As Bordt (1999:374) points out, “Though the [instructor] may come close to matching the conditions of the simulation to those of the real world, divergence and an element of artificiality are always possible.” Ultimately, interactive exercises or simulation games can create a false reality, but with proper debriefing of students afterwards, a genuine understanding of a substantive issue can be achieved (Hagan 2000; Bordt 1999; Dorn 1989).

Teaching the structural nature of social stratification is especially challenging as most students have a perceived notion that success or failure is strictly dependent upon individual characteristics and attributes having little to do with structural and social conditions. Interactive exercises may help students gain more knowledge about social class and how income stratification shapes the life chances of individuals at different socioeconomic levels. In addition, interactive and simulation exercises push students to think at higher levels, challenging previously held beliefs and attitudes by encouraging students to reevaluate what they believe about a variety of issues common in society and within the criminal justice field. Activities such as the one described below are “well suited to enhance student participation in class so that students can discover their own ‘truths’ about crime and justice” (Robinson 2000:67).
THE ACTIVITY

A modified version of the Monopoly game has been used in a variety of sociology classes to illustrate the structural nature of social inequality (Jessup 2001). The activity as presented here is a further modified version of Monopoly, and is best suited for criminal justice and social justice/injustice issues. This version of Monopoly has been used in Introduction to Criminal Justice, Criminology, Corrections, and Critical Analysis of the Criminal Justice System. In addition, it has been used at two different size universities (i.e., a large private university and a mid-sized state university). On the average, students were of traditional age (18 to 25 years old), white (around 85 percent), criminal justice majors or minors, and female (approximately 60 to 70 percent).

In general, students found this exercise to be fun and enlightening and were able to relate their position in the game to that in real life. Only a few students have stated that this exercise does not represent what may actually occur with regard to the structural inequality present in the criminal justice system and other social institutions.

A thorough discussion of theoretical explanations regarding crime and criminal behavior should take place prior to using this activity. Prior discussion helps students to associate crime theories to what they will experience while playing the game. The authors found that students will develop a better understanding of various theories based on their exposure to the activity and resulting discussion about the role they played in the game. This includes not only their individual choices during the game, but also how structural components may limit to some degree their ability to make certain choices (i.e., several players beginning the game being more financially viable and having property in which to immediately be able to collect rent when landed upon).

At the beginning of the class, each of the students number off to form groups of six: five players and one observer. Each player is given instructions on the game set-up and the rules that differ from the typical regulations of the game (see Appendix A for modified rules to the game). The observer is given a sheet that explains his/her role in the game (see Appendix B for guidelines).

The player who is number one represents the highest income bracket (the pot of gold - a new playing piece found in the latest edition of Monopoly). This player is the banker and is perceived as the leader of the game. Each pot of gold is given a Monopoly game and is responsible for distributing packets to the other players (prepared in advance by the instructor).

Each of the five players represents one income quintile in the United States population. The amount of money given to each player is based on the percentage of the aggregate income in the United States held by the quintile he or she represents. These figures are based on the report by the U. S. Census Bureau, Money Income in the United States, 2000.
Table 1. Percent Share of Household Income by Quintile and Monopoly Set-Up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quintile</th>
<th>Percentage of Aggregate Income*</th>
<th>Token</th>
<th>Starting Assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>$270 None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>Wheelbarrow</td>
<td>665 None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>Car</td>
<td>1,120 Connecticut Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>Horse</td>
<td>1,725 Pennsylvania RRD Electric Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>Pot of Gold</td>
<td>3,728 Park Place Boardwalk Reading RRD B. &amp; O. RRD 4 Houses to put on Park Place or Boardwalk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Included in each packet are tokens that represent the five quintiles. The pieces are identified as follows: the top quintile is the pot of gold, followed by the horse, the car, the wheelbarrow, and the iron (the lowest quintile). Table 1 above describes the token, property, and money each player receives at the start of the game.

Before the game starts, the instructor reviews the modified rules of the game and explains the economic status of each token. The modified rules include students being told the amount each token receives at the beginning of the game as well as the amount of money they will receive for passing “GO” (see Table 2). The amount received for passing “GO” ($200 is the standard amount in regular Monopoly) is determined by multiplying the aggregate income for players (5 X $200 = $1000) by the percentage indicated in each quintile. Funds received for passing “GO” (including any “Chance” or “Community Chest” cards drawn during the game) are indicated in Table 2 below. Amounts have been rounded for the purpose of making this event easier for the players.

**TABLE 2. Funds For Passing “GO”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Token</th>
<th>Funds (In Dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelbarrow</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot of Gold</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rules regarding loans and gifts are then explained by the instructor. The limit for loans and gifts are $500 and $200 respectively and may be given once during the game. A player cannot receive more than one loan or one gift during any game. Loans must be repaid before the player is allowed to buy property, houses, or hotels.

If students decide to auction any of their property, they are reminded that the banker becomes the auctioneer and receives ten percent of the selling price. For example, if the property is auctioned for $200, the banker (who is also the pot of gold) receives $20, leaving $180 for the seller.

Merton's strain theory and rational choice theory are discussed to demonstrate how some individuals in society may be tempted or motivated to use alternative means to reach their goals. Players who have less than $25 in assets (including property and cash) may choose to pick a legal or illegal opportunity card to help them financially and keep them in the game. Each player is allowed a maximum of three opportunity cards during any one the game.

Prior to the exercise, the instructor creates two types of opportunity cards: legal ones and illegal ones. LEGAL OPPORTUNITY CARDS: If a player chooses a legal card to improve his/her financial standing, he/she receives a card that states they have made money of lost money by legal means. For example, a card may say the player helped a neighbor build a fence and received $75 for this assistance. The card may also state that while helping the neighbor, the player hurt his/her back and went to the doctor for a cost of $100. This means the player owes the bank $25. In this case, even though the player chose a legal card, he/she lost additional money and did not improve his financial status.

The instructors should make sure there are a variety of cards so players have the opportunity to acquire funds legally. However, as is often the case in real life, a small percentage of these cards should have negative consequences. The legal opportunity cards currently used by the authors limit the amount of money a player may receive. The highest sum a player may receive without negative consequences (associated with the event) is $500. The highest sum that a player may lose is $50.

ILLEGAL OPPORTUNITY CARDS: These cards give players the opportunity to make money through illegal means. For example, a card may state that the player has stolen a big screen television set from a neighbor and sold it for $500. For this player, the illegal activity has been a positive experience. However, as in real life, there may be negative consequences associated with these cards. For example, a card might state he/she was arrested after selling an ounce of cocaine to an undercover police officer. The consequence for this player is to go straight to jail, lose two turns, and pay a fine of $200. Of course, this is a simplistic description of what might actually happen if caught selling drugs to an undercover police
office, but for most students the scenario is significant enough to understand the implications of the event. As was the case for legal opportunity cards, illegal opportunity cards should have a percentage of negative consequence cards. In our game, a little over half (55%) of the cards used for illegal opportunities have some type of negative consequence associated with the event. In addition, illegal opportunity cards should include both conventional crimes and “white-collar” crimes (i.e., tax evasion, bank fraud, embezzlement, etc.).

The observers follow the game to record the reactions and interactions of the players. It is important that they do not give advice or interact with the players any more than necessary. Their guideline sheet includes questions related to the student’s initial reaction to their tokens and their “class position,” the strategies players use to stay in the game, how players deal with giving or receiving loans and/or gifts, how difficult or easy it is for students to decide on a legal or illegal opportunity card, how students react to players who take an illegal opportunity card, and the reactions of players forced out of the game due to lack of funds.

Students are given no other rules to follow except those provided by the Monopoly game itself. Official rules are followed in all other cases and are available if students need them during the game.

Students who have not played Monopoly before may find themselves in a less than desirable position. By not knowing the rules and not knowing how to play, they must trust fellow players. These players are compared to those in the criminal justice system who must rely on individuals they do not know or trust (i.e., police officers, lawyers, judges, probation officers, and the like) to take their best interest into consideration and to instruct them how to best handle their case(s). In a study conducted by Huggins (2001) with women in prison on their legal options, the author found the women were forced to rely on those within the criminal justice system to explain how the system worked. Frequently, these women did not understand various legal procedures and felt they were at a disadvantage because of their lack of knowledge regarding the legal rules and regulations about their case and the resulting disposition handed down by the court. Several women stated they had been “railroaded” because they put too much trust in their lawyer(s) and the criminal justice system.

The time designated to play this game depends on the length of the class. Generally, the game has been used in classes that range from 90 minutes to 180 minutes. The authors found that 60 minutes is the most appropriate time necessary to give (at least) one student in each group the opportunity to take a legal or an illegal opportunity card. At the end of the game, players count their money and the cash value of the property acquired during the game, recording this information on the sheets provided. The students are asked to write a brief summary of their reactions by answering a series of questions related to their position in the game, such as
how they felt about other players, their feelings if and when a legal or illegal opportunity card was taken, how they felt if and when others took one of the opportunity cards, and their opinions of the game in relation to how it simulates a variety of socio-economic positions (see Appendix C for a sample reaction sheet). Both the players and observers are asked to spend time reflecting on the nature of the game and how the exercise can provide further insight into a variety of theories already utilized to explain individual and/or group participation in various types of crime.

**STUDENTS’ REACTIONS TO THE ACTIVITY**

When a class period is less than 90 minutes, the authors recommend that instructors schedule the next class session for discussion so the students can talk about their reactions to the exercise. In classes that are longer than 90 minutes, the discussion should follow immediately after the end of the game. As stated earlier, this debriefing is an important part of the learning process and should be used to enhance the knowledge students have gained from their experience (Hagan 2000; Bordt 1999; Dorn 1989). This discussion, led by the instructor, usually includes references to various theories (i.e., rational choice theories, structural theories, social process theories, and conflict theory) discussed during the semester. Keeping these theories in mind, students are asked how they viewed the players who tried to stay in the game (i.e., remained financially viable) by using either the legal or illegal cards. Instructors should encourage students to reflect on their position in the social structure and how it influenced their “life chances” and their individual choices while playing. In our experiences, the majority of students talked about the advantages of the pot of gold and how other players had to “struggle to keep pace.” In addition, students compare the roll of the dice to real life, in that individuals are not always in control of the things that happen. This makes it difficult to predict what an individual may need or desire at any particular time in his/her life in order to live a satisfactory existence.

Many students whose token represented the lowest quintile (the iron) expressed that it did not matter what they chose to do because they often spent much of their time in jail and could not get ahead. Several students whose token was the iron stated that being in jail was preferable because they were less likely to lose money while in jail and therefore were able to stay in the game longer.

On many occasions the pot of gold players stated that the money and property they acquired gave them “power” over the other players. Frequently, these students remarked that they began to act “greedy” and were able to take control of how others played the game. For example, one student stated,

I was glad when one of the other players left the game because this meant I could take her property and money. This gave me a
great sense of power and control. Being able to take more and more property meant I totally controlled the game and players then had to ask me for help. This was a real power trip.

This statement represents the general tone of those students who had the pot of gold token. Some of the same students expressed they were very conscious that the players below them, particularly the iron and wheelbarrow, did everything they could to stay in the game, which often meant taking illegal opportunities.

Students in the second (the horse) and third (the car) quintile expressed some frustration because, although they had ample funds at the beginning of the game, they spent money quickly and found themselves low on funds toward the end of the game. One student stated, “I lost a lot of money right off the bat. I never had to do anything illegal, but at times it made me want to take the risk and join in with the illegal activities because my funds were short.” Other students said that they felt structurally safe but experienced empathy for the iron and wheelbarrow. As one student put it, “You have to have money to make money and I saw this played out clearly in this game.” Another student expressed that prior to this game,

I sincerely believed that people make a rational choice to commit crimes for profit. However, now I can see how some people can actually be put into a position where crime seems the only way out and they take the risk even knowing they might get caught and sent to jail and/or prison.

Several students in both the second and third quintile levels also indicated that by spending freely and being overly optimistic about their chances of staying in the game (and even winning) they were actually put in a position of thinking that taking an illegal opportunity card was their best option. The same students equated this move to the possible rationale used by those in middle and upper income levels for committing crimes. One student stated, “I had over extended myself. Therefore, for me to stay in the game and to continue being able to play at the level I wanted, I felt it was necessary for me to choose an illegal opportunity card. I knew this was a risk but I hoped it would be worth it.”

It is interesting to note that wheelbarrow players repeatedly talk about being careful about how and when they spent their money. Many of these students managed to stay in the game without having to use either legal or illegal opportunity cards. However, they also stated that the game was very frustrating due to the restrictions the economic level afforded them.

As mentioned before, there is usually at least one person in each group who must decide whether to take a legal or illegal opportunity card. These cards promote the most discussion among students. For some, the decision to take one or the other card can be difficult. Over the years, the authors have observed that, overall, more female students chose a legal opportunity card the first time around. However, when choosing the legal opportunity card, both female and male students expressed that they wanted to do “the
right thing.” In four years, only one student (a female whose father was a police officer), refused to take an illegal opportunity card at some point during the game. Nevertheless, the majority of students who were faced with having to choose one card or the other, chose at least one illegal opportunity card during a game. Many expressed the feeling that although there was a risk involved and it made them feel “guilty,” the feelings of “jealousy” took priority over their original beliefs and ideals. As one student stated (her token was the car),

I was very jealous of the players economically above me. I wanted to be able to buy property and make more money. However, I was unable to do this. Fortunately, I did not have to take an opportunity card, but if I had it would have been an illegal one. I truly understand how situations may arise where there seems to be no other option than criminal activity due to wanting to either maintain status quo or from the lack of monetary resources.

Various students plainly stated that they had no qualms about taking an illegal opportunity card. A common remark from students was, “You do what you have to and this may sometimes include doing things that are not always legal.” Observers frequently wrote that players who took an illegal opportunity card seemed relatively unconcerned because taking this opportunity was perceived as a more “profitable” solution to their situation.

A brief discussion about students’ feelings when forced to leave the game offered some interesting insights. During one game, the iron was forced out of the game. The player asked what should be done with the token. Another player responded, “Oh let’s just put you in jail because that’s where you are going to end up anyway.” In another game, the horse (representing the second quintile) was forced out of the game. The horse argued, “This isn’t fair. I represent the middle class. I am not supposed to lose. The iron or wheelbarrows are supposed to leave, not me.”

Finally, the issue of loans or gifts is discussed. Generally, more than half the students indicated they would not ask for help. If a gift or loan was offered, they typically stated they would refuse it. Many students said that gifts were more frequently offered by those in the third quintile (the car), while loans (which had to be paid back) were offered by players from the first (the pot of gold) or second (the horse) quintiles. When offering help, students frequently observed that the pot of gold would exhibit a superior attitude.

CONCLUSIONS

The majority of students who played the game said the experience was insightful and led them to question their previous beliefs about social class and criminal behavior. Many were surprised at how difficult it was to move across the social classes and that position within the social structure influenced the choices an individual makes. The experience challenged their
beliefs that individual talents and/or aspirations are enough to overcome structural barriers to upward mobility. It became more evident to the students why different class levels are often motivated to engage in criminal activities for the purpose of financial gain. They began to understand why the motivation to take risk varies across the social classes. In addition, various risks taken may be due to either absolute deprivation or relative deprivation of an individual or group, or simply due to wanting to maintain status quo as may be the case with those engaging in various forms of “white-collar” crime.

The authors believe it is important for students to understand that criminal behavior is not solely a function of only the lower class. This activity introduces the complex and often controversial issues that surround social class and criminality. The game also provides a reference point for other sociological and criminological discussions such as socialization, stereotypes, labeling, deviance, and the motivation to engage in criminal behavior. As with other simulation activities, the challenge is to ensure that students relate their experience in the game to the real world and the concepts in which it is intended to represent. When done appropriately, the exercise opens the door to the suggestions that social structure, despite individual characteristics, may play a role in determining what goals an individual may achieve in his/her life.
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APPENDIX A

Rules for the Game:
The game will be played for one hour. The player who has the most assets at the end of the game is the winner. Please follow the rules listed below because the game has a different twist than regular monopoly.

Players are as follows:
1=Pot of Gold
2=Horse
3=Car
4=Wheelbarrow
5=Iron

*The Banker is the Pot of Gold and is in charge of distributing money when needed.*

Each player starts with the following amount of money:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Player</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pot of Gold</td>
<td>$3,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse</td>
<td>1,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelbarrow</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Players receive the following property at the beginning of the game (at no cost to the player):

- **Pot of Gold**: Park Place, Boardwalk, Reading Railroad, B. & O. Railroad, and four houses to put on Park Place and Boardwalk
- **Horse**: Pacific Avenue, Pennsylvania Railroad, and the Electric Company
- **Car**: Connecticut Avenue
- **Wheelbarrow**: No property
- **Iron**: No property

When passing go players receive the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Player</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pot of Gold</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelbarrow</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Loans/Gifts to Players:*

Players may help other players financially. However, the help must be in the form of a loan or a gift. Loans cannot be for more than $500 and gifts cannot be more than $200 to any one player. A loan or a gift can only be...
made once during the game. Loans must be paid back before the player (who borrowed the money) can buy property, houses, or hotels.

Property Liquidation: When Player Cannot Pay His/Her Debt:

Property may be auctioned to the highest bidder if a player cannot pay his/her debt. The Banker auctions off the property and for doing this service is given 10 percent of the selling price. For example: if the property is auctioned for $300 the banker gets $30.

Players with less than $25:

If a player has less than $25 in money or assets, he/she may choose to pick a card that may help them stay in the game. The cards are held by the teacher and the person may choose to get additional money either legally or illegally. However, both sets of cards are opportunity cards and can put the person further into debt. Each player may only choose three additional cards.
APPENDIX B

Exercise in Social Status and Crime

Observer’s Instructions

Notate the initial reactions of each player to his/her position in the “social structure” as evidenced by their assigned token and starting cash value.

Pot of Gold
Horse
Car
Wheelbarrow
Iron

As the game proceeds, observe the interactions of the group. How are the players responding to the circumstances of the game? (Refer to players by their tokens not their name.)

What strategies do the players use to stay in the game?

Did players have a difficult time deciding whether to take the illegal opportunities?

Did any of the players ask for loans or try to make arrangements with the other players?

Did any of the wealthier players share their resources with other players? If yes, was it a gift, a loan, or some other type of arrangement?

How did players react to leaving the game due to a lack of funds?

Who appeared to be “in charge” of the game?

How did players react to the loss of a player?

How did players react to those who choose illegal opportunities to get more funds?

Any other reactions?
APPENDIX C

Exercise in Social Status and Crime

Your Token: ____________    Your Name: ____________
Starting Assets: ____________
Ending Assets: ____________

Please write a brief summary of your reactions to this exercise. Consider the following questions in your answer. What were your initial feelings and reaction to your position in the “social structure?” Did you make it to the end of the exercise or were you forced out by lack of funds? Did you take the opportunity to make additional money by illegal means? If so, how did this make you feel? Did you ask for help or were you asked for help? If so, what was your response? How did you feel when you had to leave the game or when others had to leave the game? Did this exercise provide insight into others and their socioeconomic levels? Did the exercise make you think about how the lack of funds or opportunities might create situations whereby a person might consider criminal activities?